

REMARKS

Entry of the preceding amendment in response to the final Office Action of March 23, 2006 on the above-identified application, and a reconsideration of the claims as amended, are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 through 6 are pending in this application. In the action, all claims were rejected on both formal and prior-art grounds.

Turning to page 2 of the action, the abstract of the disclosure was objected to because it contains the legal word “comprising”. The abstract has been amended above to replace the legal “comprising” with the more colloquial “including”.

Claims 1 and 3 through 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In the preceding amendment, claim 1 has been amended to correct the “antecedent basis” problem identified by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 4 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5, 6, 23, 24, 13, 14, 19 through 22, 33 through 36 and 38 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/339,479, which is assigned of record to Kabushiki Kaisha Suzutora (Suzutora Corporation) of Aichi, Japan at Reel 013848, Frame 0224.

The present application, upon information and belief, is also owned by Kabushiki Kaisha Suzutora, but is not so assigned of record in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. The applicants will endeavor to make such an assignment and to record it in the Assignment Division, so that a terminal disclaimer may be filed at such time as there has been an allowance in the present case.

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 6,074,981 to Tada et al. Tada shows a photocatalyst layer containing titanium oxide and other metallic oxide semiconductors. The photocatalytic layer includes fluorine which increases the metallic oxide's photocatalytic activity. The present functional fiber sheet has a coating of physically vapor-deposited film comprising metallic oxides and having no fluorine. Claim 1 has been amended above to make this distinction more clearly. As fluorine and its presence is such an important part of the invention disclosed in Tada, it neither shows nor suggests a vapor-deposited film comprising metallic oxides lacking this element. Claim 1, as amended above, is respectfully submitted to be patentable over Tada, as are claims 3, 5 and 6 which depend therefrom.

Claim 4 was also rejected as being unpatentable for obviousness over Tada, and has been amended above in a similar manner. As so amended, claim 4 is respectfully submitted to be patentable over Tada.

In view of the above, a reconsideration of claims 1 and 3 through 6 is respectfully requested, and their allowance earnestly sought.

Respectfully submitted,



John F. Gulbin
Registration No. 33,180

Pitney Hardin LLP
7 Times Square
New York, NY 10036-7311
212.297.5800